



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,085	08/23/2001	Mikael Nilsson	34647-00438USPT	9906
27045	7590	10/11/2005	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR-C11 PLANO, TX 75024				BATES, KEVIN T
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2155		

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/938,085	NILSSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin Bates	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.



Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on September 16, 2005.

Claims 1-18 are previously presented and pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Flaherty (6275824).

Regarding claim 1, O'Flaherty teaches a method for contacting an origin server from a user (Column 5, lines 30 – 46; Column 14, lines 58 – 65), comprising the steps of: generating a minimal user profile for the user, said minimal user profile containing user designated CPI (Column 4, lines 41 – 60); establishing a connection with the origin server using the minimal user profile (Column 5, lines 30 – 46); determining if a privacy policy of the origin server at least meets privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15); and providing at least one second user profile containing a more detailed CPI to the origin server if the privacy policy of the origin server at least meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

Regarding claim 4, O'Flaherty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing further comprises the step of providing the at least one second user profile containing the more detailed CPI in each request to the Origin Server (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

Regarding claims 9 and 14, O'Flaherty teaches a wireless communications node associated with a user (Figure 1, elements 150, 140, and 102), comprising: a minimal user profile containing only user designated CPI (Column 4, lines 41 – 60); a second user profile containing a more detailed CPI (Column 15, lines 11 – 15); control logic for providing the minimal user profile to establish an initial connection to an origin server (Column 5, lines 30 – 46) and to provide the second user profile to the origin server if the privacy policy of the origin server meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

Regarding claims 12 and 17, O'Flaherty teaches the wireless communication node of claims 9 and 14, wherein the control logic attaches the second user profile to each request toward the origin server if the privacy policy of the origin server meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Leppinen (6735186).

Regarding claim 2, O'Flaherty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of establishing further comprises the step of: caching the minimal user profile within a trusted node between the origin server and the user (Column 4, lines 8 – 19).

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the trusted node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session.

Leppinen teaches a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Regarding claim 5, O'Flaherty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing further comprises the steps of: caching the at least one second user profile (Column 4, lines 8 – 19; Column 15, lines 11 – 15) and using that profile to forward the information between the user and the origin server (Column 15, lines 11 – 15; Column 5, lines 30 – 46).

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the network node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session.

Leppinen teaches a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Regarding claim 6, O'Flaherty teaches a method for contacting an origin server from a user, comprising the steps of: generating a minimal user profile for the user, said minimal user profile containing user designated CPI (Column 4, lines 41 – 60); caching the minimal user profile within the a network node (Column 4, lines 8 – 19); establishing a connection with the origin server using the minimal user profile (Column 5, lines 30 – 46); determining if a privacy policy of the origin server meets privacy preferences of the user using the minimal user profile (Column 15, lines 11 – 15); and providing a second user profile containing a more detailed CPI in each subsequent request to the origin server if the privacy policy of the origin server at least meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the network node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session.

Leppinen teaches a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Regarding claims 13 and 18, O'Flaherty teaches the wireless communication node of claims 9 and 14, wherein the control logic forwards the second user profile a single time for caching at a network node if the privacy policy of the origin server meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 4, lines 8 – 19; Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the network node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session.

Leppinen teaches a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Claims 3, 10, 11, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Barrett (6581059).

Regarding claim 3, O'Flaherty teaches the method of claim 1.

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the step of determining further comprises the steps of: requesting a policy reference file and a privacy policy from the origin server; receiving the policy reference file and the privacy policy from the origin comparing the privacy policy of the origin server with the privacy preferences of the user.

Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private

information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Regarding claims 10 and 15, O'Flaherty teaches the wireless communications node of claims 9 and 14.

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the control logic requests the privacy policy of the origin server.

Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user

requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, O'Flaherty teaches the wireless communications node of claims 10 and 15.

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the control logic compares the privacy policy of the origin server with the privacy preferences of the user.

Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Leppien as applied to claims 2, 5, 6, 13, and 18 above, and further in view of Barrett (6581059).

Regarding claim 7, O'Flaherty teaches the method of claim 6.

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the step of determining further comprises the steps of: requesting a policy reference file and a privacy policy from the origin server; receiving the policy reference file and the privacy policy from the origin comparing the privacy policy of the origin server with the privacy preferences of the user.

Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Regarding claim 8, O'Flaherty teaches a method for contacting an origin server from a user (Column 5, lines 30 – 46; Column 14, lines 58 – 65), comprising the steps of: generating a minimal user profile for the user, said minimal user profile containing user designated CPI (Column 4, lines 41 – 60); caching the minimal user profile within a network node (Page 15, Column 2, lines 43 – 61); establishing a connection with the origin server using the minimal user profile (Column 5, lines 30 – 46); providing the second user profile to a network node if the privacy policy of the origin server at least meets the privacy preferences of the user; caching the second user profile at the network node (Column 15, lines 11 – 15); and attaching the second user profile to all requests received from the user and forwarded to the origin server (Column 4, lines 8 – 19; Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the network node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session or requesting a policy reference file and a privacy policy from the origin server receiving the policy reference file and the privacy policy from the origin server; comparing the privacy policy of the origin server with the privacy preferences of the user to determine if a privacy policy of the origin server meets privacy preferences of the user.

Leppinen teaches a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP

gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 16, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that the reference, O'Flaherty does not disclose establishing a connection with the origin server using the minimal user profile or determining if a private policy of the origin server meets the privacy preferences of the user. The examiner disagrees the reference, O'Flaherty, discloses a profile that includes less information than the actual profile, and that the system uses that profile to

perform the communications between the client and a server as seen in Column 5, lines 30 – 37, where when the client wants anonymous communication the profile is reduced to minimal, non-identifying information, and the reduced profile is used for the transaction. O'Flaherty also discloses checking the data source privacy parameters (Column 16, line 10 – 11) and using the information from the data source and from the user privacy parameters to determine which type of access that the transaction has access too (Column 16, lines 6 – 15).

Regarding claim 3, the applicant argues that the reference Barrett discloses the server determining whether the server should let the user get access to data, not the server asking the user for data. The examiner disagrees, the reference Barrett, in the combination with O'Flaherty is only relied upon to show the ability for a system to determine or negotiate privacy parameters before getting access to a more complete profile, the reference O'Flaherty deciding which profile should be involved in a transaction, a minimal or one containing private information, while Barrett improves O'Flaherty by disclosing features on how to negotiate and decide whether the privacy parameters of the user and server agree in order to let more detailed/private information be exchanged.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB
October 6, 2005


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER